REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 742 UD 003 998

A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT TO DISADVANTAGED IN-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES DURING THE SUMMER.

BY- PECK, BERNARD AND OTHERS

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 30 SEP 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.96 99P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUMMER PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION, DATA, COMMUNITY AGENCIES (PUBLIC), INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, SCHOOL ATTITUDES, SOCIAL ATTITUDES, *ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, *ADOLESCENTS, NEW YORK CITY, NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

A SUMMER PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, AGES 16-22, WAS EVALUATED. THE PROGRAM, WHICH WAS DEVELOPED BY THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS AND CONDUCTED JOINTLY BY THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SIX COMMUNITY AGENCIES, ATTEMPTED (1) TO IMPROVE THE READING AND WRITING SKILLS OF THE ENROLLEES, (2) TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO HAVE REALISTIC OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, BASED ON FINISHING HIGH SCHOOL, (3) TO REACH A GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH AND THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY AGENCIES IN THEIR EDUCATION, AND (4) TO DEVELOP INNOVATIVE TEACHING METHODS. INFORMATION FOR THE EVALUATION WAS COLLECTED BY INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES. THE RESPONSES SHOWED THAT THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL OF 75 TO 80 PERCENT OF THE ENROLLEES IMPROVED AND THAT THEIR APPRECIATION OF THE NEED FOR CONTINUING THEIR EDUCATION INCREASED. HOWEVER, THE PROGRAM COULD BE IMPROVED IN SEVERAL WAYS--(1) PROCUREMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES SHOULD BE REVISED, (2) PLANNING AND STAFFING SHOULD BEGIN AT LEAST 9 MONTHS BEFORE THE PROGRAM BEINGS, (3) THE ROLES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNITY AGENCIES SHOULD BE DEFINED CLEARLY, (4) BASIC DATA ON THE ENROLLEES SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE AGENCIES BY THE BOARD, AND (5) FEEDBACK ON THE ENROLLEES SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THEIR HOME SCHOOLS. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012742

UD 003 998

Letter Sen
3/14/6
nw

03998

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT TO DISADVANTAGED IN-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES DURING THE SUMMER

Dr. Bernard Peck
Research Director

Dr. Max Weiner
Associate Research Director

Mrs. Marcella Williams
Associate Research Director

September 30, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Topic — Page

I INTRODUCTION 1
II OBJECTIVES OF THIS EVALUATION 4
III OBJECTIVES OF AGENCIES AND RELEVANT PROCEDURES USED BY AGENCIES 6
IV PROCEDURES USED IN THIS EVALUATION 12

V FINDINGS

1. Enrollees - Computerized 17

2. Teachers

A. Questionnaires Computerized 38
B. Open-End Questionnares 49
VI EDUCATIONAL DIRECTORS' APPRAISALS 55
VII CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' APPRAISALS 57
VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 59
APPENDIX A Evaluation Staff 62

APPENDIX B Instruments Used in Evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) developed a program to provide disadvantaged youths between ages 16 and 22, who were attending school, with jobs and educational enrichment during the summer of 1966. The program was carried on by various community agencies and by the New York City Board of Education (Board). The following were the agencies with which the Board cooperated:

Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth in Action (YIA)
Community Council of Greater New York (CCGNY)
Haryou-Act (Haryou)
Mobilization for Youth (MFY)
New York City Mission Society (NYCMS)
United Neighborhood House (UNH)

The purpose of the study described in this report was the evaluation of the effectiveness of the educational enrichment aspects of the New York City summer program, having special reference to the contribution of the Board of Education.

The evaluation was performed at the request of the Board of Education by the Center for Urban Education (CUE), an independent educational research agency.

Background and Initial Planning

Initially it was contemplated by the Board of Education that NYC enrollees would be given a work assignment of four hours each day and an educational program for two hours each day. The educational program, for the most part, was to be remedial, ungraded, and centered around the work program of the enrollees. The teaching was to be done by a large number of teaching aides who were to be enlisted from among college "work-study" students. Vista and other volunteers, and from among the more able students enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Small group and tutorial procedures were to be employed in the actual teaching. Supervision and assistance with the curriculum would be provided by Board of Education personnel who would furnish the necessary professional dimension to the program. In most instances the program itself was to be conducted in the neighborhood facilities of the cooperating community action agencies.

In point of fact, the agencies, with the exception of the Community Council, generally hired qualified teaching personnel, frequently Board personnel, and consequently supervision of the sort initially planned was not provided to the agencies. Board of Education teaching personnel for the most part then assumed a straight teaching function, working alongside agency personnel. In the case of the Community Council the agency did employ teaching aides and the Board teachers thus assumed a role more in keeping with that originally contemplated.

The Board of Education also provided a total of 12 curriculum specialists, 10 resource teachers, and a librarian. The curriculum specialists functioned generally, although not always, in conventional ways, i.e., they developed and provided educational materials. The curriculum specialists were rotated and spent some time at each agency. Resource teachers were to serve as a bilingual resource for facilitating communication between the teachers and the Spanish speaking enrollees. As a consequence of the relative lack of Spanish speaking enrollees, the resource teachers did not always function in terms of the original conception. A number taught, and two assumed the role of foreign language instructors (Spanish). The librarian, it was originally planned, would, among other things, service the program with the aid of a bookmobile. As will be indicated later, the book requisitions were not filled before the program was completed and the librarian consequently spent her time at the Office of the Program Coordinator developing lists of books deemed appropriate for the enrollees and for the staff and taking the initial steps towards procurement.

For administrative purposes the City was divided into four geographical areas, each headed by an Area Supervisor. Because of this geographical division each Area Supervisor sometimes was required to deal with more than one agency, and in at least one instance a teacher came under the jurisdiction of two Area Supervisors.

At the apex of the administrative pyramid was the Program Coordinator and a staff of two, one of whom had responsibility for the curriculum consultants, and one of whom paid special attention to the resource teachers.

A word about the agencies. Each agency designated a person to act, in effect, as educational director of the agency's program providing administrative direction and professional leadership. The educational directors received assistance from other agency personnel.

The Operation of the Program -Chronology

The New York City summer program, funded by the office of Economic Opportunity burst upon the scene the first week of June with operations scheduled to commence July 5 and terminate August 31, 1966. From the point of view of the Board, plans had to be developed, coordination had to be effected with NYC, and with six community agencies who were likewise involved in hasty organizational efforts, supplies, curriculum materials and library materials procured, and a staff recruited.

In the period June 6 to July 5, the Program Coordinator and his staff held meetings with Neighborhood Youth Corps personnel, with agency personnel, recruited staff, prepared the required requisitions, and in general performed required administrative and supervisory work. Some curriculum guidelines were also prepared at this time. The agencies were faced with similar problems, and in addition had to recruit the enrollees and develop the job programs. Classes most frequently did not get underway until the second or third weeks of July, and terminated generally at the end of August.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THIS EVALUATION

The evaluation basically was designed to determine the extent to which objectives sought by the Board of Education were achieved. These objectives initially were as follows:

1. The program was to be essentially remedial and result in improvement of the reading and arithmetic skills of the enrollees.
2. Enrollees would emerge with realistic occupational goals which would be perceived by the enrollees as requiring the completion of school for their attainment.
3. Participating teachers would gain deeper understandings of disadvantaged youths and their neighborhoods, and the positive role of community agencies in the education of disadvantaged youth.
4. Hopefully, innovations in teaching methods would be developed during the course of the project and would be made available to teachers of disadvantaged adolescents.

The Minutes of a July 15 meeting on this proposed evaluation, attended by representatives of Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Board of

Education and the Center for Urban Education, indicated the following additional objectives:

1. The gauging of any attitude change toward the school system on the part of agency personnel and enrollees.
2. The presentation of a factual account of the program.

An attempt has been made during this evaluation to provide data relating to these objectives, although this was not contemplated when the instruments were developed to determine whether Board objectives were achieved.

It should be noted immediately that the agencies had their own list of objectives. These objectives, except in the instance of Mobilization for Youth, were, as stated, similar to the Board's, although there were differences in emphasis and focus. MFY's objectives, and the procedures utilized to achieve them, were judged to be somewhat different, and the evaluation procedure utilized in this study sometimes may not validly represent the activities and outcomes of the MFY operation. Again, it is emphasized that the evaluation was designed on the basis of the statement of the Board objectives. It did not become apparent until the evaluation was underway, and after final commitment had been made to a particular research design and series of instruments that differences between Board objectives and Agency objectives became apparent.

Because of these varied objectives and the limited time between the actual initiation of the program and the end of the program, procedures which had originally been recommended for determining whether objectives were reached were not always utilized. There was no attempt to measure achievement by the use of standardized tests; instead,the only measures of achievement provided were personal appraisals by teachers and enrollees. No plans were developed to obtain achievement test scores for enrollees available in the schools in September (and appraising educational achievement during the summer through the analysis of these later tests). No parent interviews were conducted, although indirect estimates of parental attitudes towards the program were obtained. Finally, only indirect data were obtained on the relative effectiveness of the conventional school situation as compared with the Neighborhood Youth Corps situation.

III. OBJECTIVES OF AGENCIES AND RELEVANT PROCEDURES USED BY AGENCIES

Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth in Action

Objectives:

1. The need for remediation was perceived as paramount, and educational enrichment was defined as remediation. However, the approach was to be tailored to the needs of the individuals and was to develop out of the requirements of the job at which they were working. Further the curriculum materials developed were to be creative.

2. Provide enrichment where it was indicated.

3. Cultivate positive attitudes among enrollees towards school, and show relationship of school to job attainment.

4. Enable enrollees to communicate more effectively with teachers during the regular school year, and thus to make their needs known.

5. Help enrollees understand their responsibility to the community.

6. Develop pride in the Negro and Puerto Rican cultures.

Procedures:

Curriculum materials relevant to the job experience of the enrollee were developed and these materials were used in the process of remediation. For example, if the enrollee was employed as a recreation worker he would be provided with materials describing games that he would be expected to know, rules that were to be followed, etc.

Discussions were conducted regarding the Negro and Puerto Rican cultures, and Negro deprivation was highlighted. Slides were frequently used.

Enrollees participated in community clean-up campaigns and voter registration drives.

Enrollees received one hour of instruction four days per week at a variety of sites.

The Community Council of Greater New York

Objectives:

1. To provide remedial work in arithmetic and reading.
2. To modify constructively the attitudes of enrollees towards schools by enabling them to have positive experiences with teachers.
3. To reinforce the importance of continuing education.
4. Some educational enrichment was to be provided to appropriate enrollees.

Procedures:

Materials utilized in the arithmetic and reading remediation programs were related to the real or projected life situation of the enrollees. For instance, 1040 Tax Forms constitutes curriculum materials.

The teacher aides were made conscious of the need to provide a constructive teaching-learning experience for the enrollees.

Whenever possible the utility of remaining in school was stressed. Thus, during the use of the 1040 Tax Form, the relationship between schooling and earning ability would be indicated.

Enrollees received about three hours of instruction per week at a variety of sites.

Haryou-Act

Objectives:

1. To provide remediation in a creative way by using meaningful materials such as current magazines, job-oriented pamphlets, etc., in the context of an informal teaching situation.

2. Provide educational enrichment to able Ghetto youth in areas such as philosophy, history, foreign language.

3. Cultivate constructive attitudes towards teaching and education.

4. Help enrollees develop positive self-images by utilizing the teacher's relationship with the enrollees and the enrollee's relationship with his peers.

5. Develop positive attitudes toward the role of the Negro in American history.

Procedures:

In the reading remediation program materials were developed which were relevant to the needs of the individual enrollees. For example, texts were eschewed and job-oriented materials were utilized. Units were short and could be mastered in a single session. Emphasis was placed on the achievement of good teacher-student relationships, and individual counseling on the part of teachers was encouraged. Enrollees were helped to become more test wise. Sample civil service exams were administered, and enrollees were helped to achieve a sense of competence in test situations.

Visits to the Shomburg Library were arranged and library personnel showed films relating to the Negro contribution to American history.

Class size was limited -- one teacher to ten students -- and an informal teaching atmosphere was created.

Instruction was provided each enrollee for three hours a week at a number of sites.

Mobilization for Youth

Objectives:

1. Deepen the enrollees' understandings of, and respect for, the East Side Culture.

2. Provide culture enrichment by taking enrollees outside of the East Side to experience other cultures.

3. Provide a leadership program in which the enrollees would learn to have an effect upon events instead of merely witnessing them.

4. Provide insight into mathematical and scientific concepts by utilizing them in the activities of everyday living, as well as in ordinary academic studies.

5. Provide the enrollees with teaching in areas related to their summer work.

6. Acquaint the enrollees with services available in the community.

Procedures:

Visits were made to different locations on the lower East Side and community leaders were invited to speak to the enrollees on the history and culture of the East Side.

Enrollees were taken on trips to art theaters in Greenwich Village, to see such films as "To Die in Madrid," and to restaurants such as La Fonda del Sol for dessert and coffee.

Enrollees actively participated in a voter registration drive.

Enrollees engaged in consumer education projects involving comparison shopping and discussions of quality and price merchandise.

Enrollees visited agencies such as hospitals, schools, and the welfare department. Speakers from these agencies were invited to talk about their agencies and the services provided. Films were also utilized.

The educational program was conducted at Junior High School 71. Enrollees went there twice a week for an hour and a half session.

New York City Mission Society

Objectives:

1. To provide remediation in the areas of reading and arithmetic on a one to one basis as frequently as possible.

2. To teach business administration and to help prepare enrollees for office jobs, where appropriate.

3. To teach foreign language to enrollees, where appropriate.

4. To strengthen the self-image of enrollees.

Procedures:

Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of the procedures utilized by this agency was the small group, or tutorial, instruction. Remediation in reading and math were provided in conventional ways. But what was different was the individual attention that could be given. The business administration taught consisted of instruction in Gregg Shorthand. A few of the trainees received help with French and Spanish. Presumably self-images were strengthened by the development of feelings of adequacy and competence through achievement in school work. Instruction was provided approximately three hours per week on job sites.

United Neighborhood Houses

Objectives:

1. To provide remediation in the basic skills of reading and arithmetic.
2. To provide acceleration in subjects like advanced algebra, biology, etc., where it was appropriate.
3. Develop and maintain positive attitudes towards school.
4. Develop skills in communication.

Procedures:

Informal remediation procedures, particularly in reading, were widely utilized, and materials furnished enrollees were deemed appropriate to their needs and interests, e.g., income tax forms.

Acceleration and educational enrichment were provided to some enrollees in such areas as advanced algebra and biology.

Reports indicate that teachers were aware of the need to help the enrollees achieve a greater sense of adequacy, and they functioned in ways calculated to achieve that objective.

It is stressed that the neighborhood youth summer program was generally a decentralized one. Consequently a given location may not have been following the procedures indicated.

No data were obtained on the extent to which the agencies achieved objectives relating to helping youngsters acquire understanding and respect for the Puerto Rican and Negro cultures, since this had not been initially indicated as an objective by the Board.

It is essential to note that this evaluation is not definitive but rather a limited initial evaluation which has indicated the general directions in which the program was moving, but which does not provide precise compass bearings. The speed with which the evaluation was organized was matched only by the speed of the organization of the program. The consequence is that this evaluation probably is a minimal representation of the potential effectiveness of the program.

IV. PROCEDURES USED IN THIS EVALUATION

It was obvious that the enrollees and the teachers constituted prime sources of information about the program. Additionally, it was determined that it would be useful to interview the program coordinator and his staff, the area supervisors, the curriculum specialists, and the educational directors of the agencies. Finally, the interviewers were asked to complete two forms. One required them to provide their impressions of the influences of the operation they were witnessing, and in the other, they wrote anecdotal accounts of the teaching situation. No distinction was made between agency teachers and Board personnel, nor were resource teachers singled out for special attention.

Interview schedules were therefore developed for each of the groups indicated above. Actually two instruments were developed for use with the enrollees. One was a longer form designed for use with groups 3-6 enrollees and represented a more intensive form of interviewing. The other was shorter and could be used with large groups of enrollees. It was a questionnaire rather than an interview schedule. Actually, except at MFY, it was not used with large groups of enrollees because the enrollees typically were interviewed at the job sites where they were assembled in small groups.

The instruments developed and their designations are as follows:

Interview schedule for use with enrollees - long form	ELF
Questionnaire for enrollees - short form	ESP
Interview schedule for use with teachers	TI
Interview schedule for use with Curriculum Specialists and Assistant Project Coordinator Curriculum	CSI
Interview schedule for use with Project Coordinator and Assistant Project Coordinator	PCI
Interview schedule for use with Area Supervisors	ASI
Interview schedule for use with Educational Directors	EDI
Interview anecdotal	AR
Interview questionnaire	IQ

Interviewers

All the interviewers were given orientation sessions for purposes of assuring the reliability and validity of the responses collected. Before the interviewers went out to the field, a session was conducted to acquaint them with the instruments they were to use. After a day of data collecting, the interviewers returned to the Center for a follow-up conference in order to determine what changes, if any, were necessary.

It was deemed necessary, although not economical, that two interviewers work together at a site in most instances. They arranged to meet at a site, and then working as a team, divided the interviewing responsibilities between them.

Then when all the data collecting was completed, the interviewers met as a group to discuss their findings and impressions. This conference was tape recorded.

Selection of sample - enrollees

There were approximately 6000 enrollees in the program, and it was obviously necessary to obtain a sample of such a large group. Every effort was made to randomize the selection of enrollees, but as it developed this could not be done in every situation.

At MFY where there were large groups of enrollees available at one time, interviewers were instructed to choose enrollees for interviewing (ELF) by using the place the enrollees sat in class as the basis - they selected enrollees from the left front of the room, the right front, the left rear, the right rear, and the center.

Unfortunately, the selection of enrollees often was not left up to the interviewers. At MFY, the enrollees to be interviewed sometimes were designated by the Educational Director. At other agencies the time pressures were such that the most expeditory way to obtain subjects was to have the teacher send them to the interviewing room. Also difficulties in scheduling were such that sometimes interviewers selected subjects wherever they could find them.

It is apparent that there can be no complete confidence in the sample used. Evidence that it might not be random is provided by the small size of the sample from Community Council (CCGNY), a result of scheduling difficulties. The sample from HARYOU also is not large. It seems safe to assume, however, that enrollees used as subjects represent a fair cross-section of the total enrollees in the NYC summer program. Whether the enrollees constitute a representative sample of disadvantaged youth is a matter that was not investigated by the researchers.*

Selection of sample - teachers

It was also necessary to select a sample of the approximately 300 teachers in the program. Here the procedure for selecting a sample was again dictated by the realities of the teachers' schedules and the distances to be traveled in reaching them. It was determined that as many teachers would be interviewed as could be, given the time allotted for interviewing and the size of the interviewing staff. Here again the number of teachers from Community Council (8) who were interviewed was smaller than the number from other agencies.

Selection of sample - other staff

It was determined that it would be feasible to interview all the Educational Directors or their representatives, the staff of the Program Coordinator, the Area Supervisors, and most of the Curricular Specialists (9 out of 12). This was done.

---

*Youth in Action has data indicating that the enrollees were approximately 4 years behind in reading levels, which suggests that the Program may have been reaching a representative sample.

Treatment of data obtained

The data compiled about the enrollees and the teachers generally were machine tabulated. Where appropriate, data obtained from other personnel were hand tabulated.

V. FINDINGS

This section is organized somewhat unconventionally because of the particular character of this evaluation. First, there is an evaluation of the procurement procedures utilized in the program. Then there follows a review of the administrative structure of the program. After this are presented the results of the interviews with enrollees, the questionnaires the enrollees completed, and the interviews with teachers and other personnel. The method of presentation of the latter data is as follows. First, the objectives of the program have been restated in the form of what may be designated as a series of major questions embodying the intent of the program. Following each of these major questions there appears the specific questions directed to the enrollees, teachers, etc., which bear on the major questions. For example, a major question developed was "Did the enrollees feel that they would be better able to function in school during the regular school year?" Questions asked of the enrollees which bear on this major question include:

> "How much will the school work done in the summer help in regular school?"
>
> "Did the enrollees feel that they were now more likely to finish school?"
>
> "Do you feel more or less confident about handling your school work this fall because of the summer program?"

The responses of the enrollees to each of these specific questions were set forth, and the responses were then summarized and analyzed.

The conclusions which seem to be suggested by the analyses appear in the following section in the report.

As has been indicated, the data were processed so that male-female differences in enrollee responses and differences in enrollee responses by agency were obtained. Differences among teachers by agency were also obtained.

An examination of the male-female differences revealed that while there may have been significant differences in responses to certain questions, these differences were small. Consequently, a female-male breakdown was not presented. Although the results by agency appear to be significantly differentiated, the breakdown was not presented. Tests of significance (Chi-Square) have not been made.* Certain errors in coding reduced the number of enrollees who could be assigned to the different Agencies. It will be recalled that in effect we had two groups of enrollees. One group was interviewed with the instrument designated as "long form" (ELF) and the other group was administered the questionnaire designated as "short form" (ESF).

Responses to the Questionnaires

What reliance can be placed on the validity of the enrollee responses? There were, for example, ethnic differences between interviewers and the enrollees. The interviewers were asked to rate the enrollees on their readiness and honesty with which they responded to the questionnaire. The overwhelming majority were perceived as cooperative (a few were mildly or very reluctant) during their interviews and also cooperative in arranging for enrollee interviews.

It is cautioned that the small sample of enrollees obtained from Haryou, and especially from Community Council may not be representative of enrollees from those Agencies.

---

* These tests of significance will be made shortly and the errors rectified. The results broken down by Agency and sex will then be available from C.U.E.

Concurrent Evaluations

Some of the agencies were also conducting an evaluation at the time the Center for Urban Education evaluation was going on. The Board was also conducting an evaluation or running a survey. Some people in the program were therefore required to see 3 interviewers in the same week. A few refused.

Operation of the Program - Procurement of Supplies, Curriculum Materials, and Library Materials.

The evidence indicates that the Board's Area Supervisors and the Program Coordinator and his staff moved as rapidly as possible to complete the paperwork necessary to initiate procurement procedures for the above-indicated materials which the Board was supposed to provide for the program. Procurement had to proceed, however, through the Bureau of Supplies and that Bureau was not able to complete arrangements for furnishing the required materials in nearly all instances until the program was over. The bright spot in an unhappy situation is that now these materials are available for a program next summer.

Operation of the Program - Salaries

Board of Education personnel were not paid until the program had been terminated. The evidence indicates that the morale of a number of teachers was affected adversely. The precise implication for the operations were not ascertained.

Another factor that should be considered in this section is the existence of salary differentials among the Board teachers, the Agency teacher and the Curriculum Specialists - the Board teachers were paid at a higher rate than the others. Expressions of surprise, if not of discontent, were heard, although the evaluation was not designed to elicit information on this specific point.

Operation of the Program - Administration and Supervision

Initially the Board called the teachers it was sending to the agencies "Supervisory Teachers." Their title was then changed to "Co-operating Teachers." This shift points to initial confusion in the program. It was not clear at the outset just what the roles of the Board and the Agencies were to be in relation to each other. What happened, as has been indicated above, was that the Board and the Agencies each drew up lists of objectives. While there were efforts at coordination made by the Program Coordinator, these efforts were not really effective. The Agencies were determined to run their own programs. The general climate of haste and lack of agreement on objectives were not conducive to effective coordination. What emerged from this situation, which was difficult for the Program Coordinator, was a summer program which was an Agency development. Even the teachers provided by the Board were in some instances hired at the behest of the Agencies. In any event, the policy decisions relating to professional operations were Agency decisions.

Administratively, the situation presented difficulties to a variety of personnel. Teachers and curriculum specialists were serving two masters. On one hand they were being paid by the Board and on the other hand they were supposed to function in terms of Agency-established policies.

V.1 FINDINGS - ENROLLEES

(Responses Computerized)

Characteristics of Enrollees

Total	Negro	White	Puerto Rican	Oriental	Other	N/A*
300	199	18	53	3	-	27
100%	66.3	6.0	17.7	1.0	-	9.0

This represents a cross section of the enrollee population.

---

*N/A = No Answer

E.1 What did the Enrollees feel and think about the

Questions to Enrollees:

A. How do you feel about the school part of the program?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Very Unsatisfied	N/A
300	72	174	33	17	4
100%	24.0	58.0	11.0	5.7	1.3

B. Next summer would you come back to the NYC program?

Total	Yes	No	Maybe	N/A
300	160	85	43	12
100%	53.3	28.3	14.3	3.7

C. Were you satisfied with the program?

Total	Yes	No	N/A
300	223	52	25
100%	74.3	17.3	8.0

D. Why did you go to the school part of the Summer Program?

Total	Had to go in order to be paid	I wanted to go	My parents wanted me to go	My friends went	I had nothing else to do	Other	N/A
300	108	108	8	1	30	37	7
100%	36.0	36.0	2.7	.3	10.0	12.3	2.3

E. Of the following, what do you think is the best reason for going to school this summer?

Total	To earn more money on a job	To be able to understand what is going on in the world and city better	To be able to live a happier life	To like art, music and literature	To keep me off the street	Other	N/A
300	53	158	19	13	39	2	16
100%	17.7	52.7	6.3	4.3	13.0	.7	5.3

It seems clear that the great majority of the enrollees were satisfied with the program. Having said this, it nevertheless is true that significant numbers of enrollees were dissatisfied in one way or another and were planning to terminate their schooling to obtain more lucrative employment. Educators who want to reach their entire clientele more effectively will no doubt be somewhat dissatisfied with these results. It should be noted that the last questions go beyond the educational program, and represent an evaluation of the program as a whole. It is expected that for many of the respondents, as a consequence of explanation by the interviewer, the focus was on the school part of the program.

There now appear data which in a sense are more personal, and with a more revealing edge. Thirty-six per cent say they went because they had to go in order to be paid. This may be interpreted in a number of ways. It may be a statement of fact. But other data already presented, and also some to follow, indicate that this was only one reason involved in motivation that was much more complex.

In the instance of the 10% who indicated that they went because they had nothing else to do, perhaps we may accept this at face value. There was a group who apparently did not profit from the program.

If this is an accurate report, and the great majority did feel that they could do the work, it would seem that this is an indication of the effectiveness of the program. It suggests that the program was enabling the enrollees to develop a sense of adequacy.

The majority choice of the enrollees as their first reason for going to school will be perceived by many as surprising. Having said that, the statement must be examined in terms of what it reveals about those who are surprised. For it may indicate that those who are consciously on the side of the consciously on the side of the slum youngster may be unconsciously denying them an equal capacity for sensitivity.

E.2 Did the enrollees feel that they had learned during the summer?

Questions to enrollees:

A. Of all you expected to learn this summer, how much did you learn?

Total	All of it	A lot of it	Some of it	A little of it	None of it	N/A
300	22	92	65	35	31	49
100%	7.3	30.7	21.7	11.7	10.3	16.3

B. This summer at school I learned______________:

Total	A lot	Some	Very Little	Nothing	No Response
336	99	180	45	11	1
100%	29.5	53.6	13.4	3.3	.3

59.7% realized a considerable part of their expectation and 83.1% felt that they had learned something from the summer schooling.

E.3 Did the enrollees feel that they would be better able to function in school during the regular school year?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. How much will the school work done in the summer help in regular school?

Total	A Great Deal	A Lot	Some	Very Little	None	N/A
300	56	60	112	41	27	4
100%	18.7	20.0	37.3	13.7	9.0	1.0

B. This summer, did your teacher help you with the kind of work you will do this fall?

Total	A Great Deal	Some Help	Little Help	No Help	N/A
300	75	103	33	83	6
100%	25.0	34.3	11.0	27.7	1.7

C. Do you feel more or less confident about handling your school work this fall because of the summer program?

Total	A Lot More Confident	A Little More Confident	No Change	A Little Less Confident	A lot Less Confident	No Response
336	74	139	114	3	2	4
100%	22.0	41.4	33.9	.9	.6	1.2

E.4 Did the enrollees feel that they were now more likely to finish school?

Question to Enrollees:

Have your plans for continuing school been changed in any way as a result of the summer program?

Total	Now Much More Likely To Stay	Now More likely to stay	Not Changed - Still Will Stay	Now Less Likely To Stay	Now Much Less Likely To Stay	Not Changed Still Will Leave or Not Return to School	N/A
300	88	23	172	1	3	7	6
100%	29.3	7.7	57.3	.3	1.0	2.3	2.0

It is apparent that here again the data tend to support the proposition that the program has been effective for most of the enrollers, but not for all of them. Seventy-six per cent indicate the summer program has been of at least some help for regular school. The rest feel it was of little or no help.

Thirty-eight per cent of the enrollees saw their summer teachers as not helping with the kind of work they would do in the fall.

Only a few (1.5%) have had their confidence in their ability to handle school work diminished, while 63.4% reported that their confidence has increased. A significant number, 38%, stated that they are more, or much more, likely to stay in school and 57.3% indicated they will stay in school, although their plans in this regard were unaffected by the Neighborhood Youth Corps experience. A very small number, 1.3%, indicated they are now less likely to stay.

E.5 Question to Enrollees:

How did you learn about the NYC Program?

Total	School	Guidance Teacher	Regular Teacher	Someone At A Social Agency	Friend	Minister	Other	N/A
300	20	14	7	40	139	28	50	2
100%	6.7	4.7	2.3	13.3	46.3	9.3	16.7	.7

Information about the Neighborhood Youth Corps program was communicated by word of mouth.

E.6 Are attitudes towards school more favorable?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. Did your feeling about school change this summer because of the NYC program?

Total	Feel Much Better About Learning	Feel Better	Feel the Same	Feel Worse About Learning	Feel Much Worse About Learning	N/A
300	78	75	140	4	2	1
100%	26.0	25.0	46.7	1.3	.7	3. 0

B. List the following in the order you would like (1st = the most liked, etc.).

To go back to school:

Total	First	Second	Third	Fourth	N/A
300	230	41	7	8	14
100%	76.7	13.7	2.3	2.7	4.3

To go in the Armed Forces:

Total	First	Second	Third	Fourth	N/A
300	11	51	58	145	35
100%	3.7	17.0	19.3	48.3	11.0

To go to work full time:

Total	First	Second	Third	Fourth	N/A
300	42	160	58	19	21
100%	14.0	53.3	19.3	6.3	6.3

To go into the Job Corps:

Total	First	Second	Third	Fourth	N/A
300	7	40	140	82	31
100%	2.3	13.3	46.7	27.3	9.8

The summer program did affect attitudes towards learning in constructive directions. Fifty-one per cent indicate they "feel better" or "much better" towards learning. Slightly more than 40% experienced no change in attitudes, but it may not be presumed that their attitudes are negative. Again a handful, 2%, reacted negatively.

Bearing on the question of the favorableness of the enrollees attitudes towards school is the question relating to their choice of alternative possibilities for the coming year. Approximately 77% of the enrollees indicate that they would prefer to return to school rather than go into the Army, the Job Corps, or to work. In evaluating this figure of 76.7%, we unfortunately do not have any figures relating to their choices at the beginning of the summer.

E.7 What kinds of feelings did the enrollees have about the teacher?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. How did you feel about your teacher this summer?

Total	Liked A Lot	Liked A Little	No Feeling	Didn't Like Too Much	Didn't Like At All	N/A
300	194	60	24	12	6	4
100%	64.7	20.0	8.0	4.0	2.0	1.0

B. How often did your teacher help you with your school work this summer?

Total	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	N/A
300	82	80	66	21	41	10
100%	27.3	26.7	22.0	7.0	13.7	3.0

C. How well do you think the teacher knows you?

Total	Very Well	Well	Hardly Knew Me	Did Not Know Me At All	N/A
300	81	142	55	17	5
100%	27.0	47.3	18.3	5.7	1.3

D. How did you feel about asking the teacher questions?

Total	Always Easy To Ask	Most Of The Time Easy To Ask	Sometimes Easy To Ask	Most Of The Time Hard To Ask	Always Hard To Ask	N/A
300	188	65	31	7	3	6
100%	62.7	21.7	10.3	2.3	1.0	1.4

E. How well do you think your teacher this summer knew you?

Total	Very Well	Well	Hardly Knew Me	Did Not Know Me At All	No Response
336	71	176	63	25	1
100%	21.1	52.4	18.8	7.4	.3

F. How do you feel about each of the following people from the summer program?

1. Teacher:

Total	Liked A Lot	Liked A Little	No Feelings Either Way	Didn't Like Too Much	Didn't Like At All	One Teacher was Liked A Lot, Other Did Not Like	
336	180	90	36	11	12	7	
100%	53.6	26.8	10.7	3.3	3.6	1.5	

2. Crew Chief:

Total	Liked A Lot	Liked A Little	No Feelings Either Way	Didn't Like Too Much	Didn't Like At All	Didn't Have One	N/A
336	206	76	24	9	15	2	4
100%	61.3	22.6	7.1	2.7	4.5	.6	1.2

The enrollees generally esteemed the teachers. Only a relatively few were neutral or negative. The great majority felt that the teacher was approachable. Twenty-four per cent of group I stated that the teacher either hardly knew them or didn't know them, but a substantial majority indicate a closeness of relationships. Again about 20% indicate that the teacher never or seldom helped them, but the great majority indicate that the teacher helped them at least sometimes.

E.8 **How did the enrollees feel about the NYC summer school as compared with regular school?**

Question to Enrollees:

A. How did you feel about regular school?

Total	Liked It Very Much	Liked It	No Feeling Either Way	Disliked It A Little	Disliked It A Lot	N/A
300	108	131	21	30	7	3
100%	36.0	43.7	7.0	10.0	2.3	1.0

B. How would you feel about regular school if it were just like the summer school program?

Total	Like It Very Much	Like It	No Feeling Either Way	Would Dislike It A Little	Would Dislike It A Lot	N/A
300	83	86	29	52	45	5
100%	27.7	28.7	9.7	17.3	15.0	1.0

C. If you could pick your teacher during the school year, of the following, whom would you pick?

Total	Regular School Teacher	Summer School Teacher	Crew Chief	None	N/A
300	109	102	66	18	5
100%	36.3	34.0	22.0	6.0	1.0

D. How much like your regular school teacher was the teacher you had this summer?

Total	Much Better	Just As Good	Almost As Good	Not As Good	Much Worse	N/A
300	78	109	51	40	13	9
100%	26.0	36.3	17.0	13.3	4.3	3.0

Regarding attitudes towards regular school, nearly 80% "liked it", 10.0% "disliked it a little" and only 2.3% "disliked it a lot". Data from other surveys asking a comparable question are not available at the present writing.

It is clear that there is a preference for regular school over the summer school.

E.9 Have the enrollees' work habits in relation to school changed constructively?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. Do you try harder now on your school work than you did before the summer program?

Total	Much Harder	Harder	Same	Less Hard	Don't Try At All	N/A
300	58	98	121	14	2	6
100%	19.3	32.7	40.3	4.7	.7	2.0

B. When you start on a school problem now, what happens?

Total	Much More Likely To Finish It Than Before Summer Program	More Likely To Finish It Than Before Summer Program	Just As Likely To Finish It Than Before Summer Program	Less Likely To Finish It Than Before Summer Program	Much Less Likely To Finish It Than Before Summer	N/A
300	75	96	107	9	6	6
100%	25.0	32.0	35.7	3.0	2.0	2.0

This self-evaluation data indicates that the enrollees see themselves as having more effective school work habits as a result of the summer program. Again, while a large number see themselves as remaining unaffected, it may not be presumed that their work habits are unfortunate.

E.10 Did the enrollees' feelings about themselves in relation to other people and the world change?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. Did the way you feel about yourself change after being in the program this summer?

Total	Feel Much More Sure Of Myself	Feel A Little More Sure Of Myself	Feel About The Same	Less Sure Of Self	Much Less Sure Of Self	N/A
300	108	100	81	3	3	5
100%	36.0	33.3	27.0	1.0	1.0	1.7

B. Did the way you want to get ahead in life change because of the summer program?

Total	Want to Get Ahead Much More	Want to Get Ahead More	Want to Get Ahead About the Same	Want to Get Ahead Less	Want to Get Ahead Much Less	N/A
300	132	76	82	4	2	4
100%	44.0	25.3	27.3	1.3	.7	1.3

C. Have your feelings about your future changed because of the summer school program?

Total	Future Will Be A Lot Better	Future Will Be A Little Better	Future Will Be The Same	Future A Little Worse	Future A Lot Worse	N/A
336	97	109	126	1	1	2
100%	28.9	32.4	37.5	.3	.3	.6

D. Do you think of what will happen to another person because of what you do?

Total	Much More Now Than Before Summer Program	More Now Than Before Summer Program	Same As Before	Less Now Than Before Summer Program	Much Less Than Before Summer Program	N/A
300	66	85	121	1	2	25
100%	22.0	28.3	40.3	.3	.7	8.3

E. Did the way you feel about people in authority change because of the program this summer?

Total	Like People Much More	Like People More	Same	Like People Less	Like People Much Less	N/A
300	51	72	148	7	6	16
100%	17.0	24.0	49.3	2.3	2.0	5.3

F. Has the amount of reading you do changed this summer?

Total	Do Much More	Do A Little More	Same As Before	Little Less	Much Less	N/A
300	74	124	85	9	6	2
100%	24.7	41.3	28.3	3.0	2.0	.7

The data reveal some very interesting and heartening things. Large numbers of enrollees report that they feel more self-confident, that they are more eager to get ahead and that the future now will be better. Many of them report that they are now more concerned about the effect of their behavior on other people, and also that their attitudes towards authority figures are more accepting. The data regarding an increased interest in reading have been included here because this too tells something about the enrollee's attitude towards self and the world.

E.11 What did the enrollees like best and dislike the most about the summer program?

Question to Enrollees:

A. What did you like best about the program?

Total	Financial	Work or Job Experience	Field Trips	Recreational	Individuals	Control Of Leisure Time (Off Sts.* etc.)	Educational	Discussions	Socialization	Counseling	Nothing	Everything	N/A
336	38	57	32	16	15	7	87	13	29	1	16	8	17
100%	11.3	17.0	9.5	4.8	4.5	2.1	25.9	3.9	8.6	.3	4.8	2.4	5.1

B. What did you dislike most about the program?

Total	Financial, Low Pay, etc.	Job Grievances	Organization + Planning	Materials Not Enough, etc.	Individuals	Personal Gripes	Deficiency In Program Content Favoring Education	Deficiency In Program Content Not Favoring Education	Rudeness Of People	Nothing	Everything	N/A
336	34	19	49	18	31	11	18	50	4	90	3	9
100%	10.1	5.7	14.6	5.4	9.2	3.3	5.4	14.9	1.2	26.8	.9	2.7

C. If you were the teacher, what changes would you make in the program?

Total	Financial, More Money	More Trips	Better Organization + Planning	More + Better Materials Or Facilities	Individuals, Better Personnel	More Discussions	Better Program Content Favorable To Education	Better Program Content Unfavorable To Education	None	A Lot, Everything	N/A
336	17	14	56	18	7	5	70	39	77	3	30
100%	5.1	4.2	16.7	5.4	2.1	1.5	20.8	11.6	22.9	.9	8.9

*off the streets

The data above represent only the first choices of the enrollees: some made several choices but their data are not presented. The educational program is selected by the largest number of enrollees, 25.9%, as the best experience in the program. In evaluating these figures, it should be noted that the field trips and the discussions may also represent educational experiences, and could be added to the total number favoring the educational experience. If the work or job experience are combined, they rank high as well.

On the other hand, almost 15% of the enrollees were critical of the educational aspects. This figure is a little lower than data already presented regarding dissatisfaction with the program but is not far out of line.

The organization and planning of the program come in for criticism in two places above. But 26.8% of the enrollees disliked nothing about the program and 22.9% would make no changes.

E.12 Have your occupational goals changed during the summer program?

Questions to Enrollees:

A. What kind of work did you want to do before you came into the NYC program?

Total	Nothing	Professional	Semi Professional	Managerial	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Unskilled	Undecided	Semi Professional Or Skilled	N/A
300 100%	13 4.3	60 20.0	49 16.3	3 1.0	64 21.3	49 16.3	13 4.3	25 8.3	4 1.3	20 6.7

B. What kind of work would you like to do when you finish school?

Total	Nothing	Professional	Semi Professional	Managerial	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Unskilled	Undecided	Semi Professional Or Skilled	N/A
300 100%	3 1.0	119 39.7	25 8.3	6 2.0	101 33.7	16 5.3	4 1.3	13 4.3	1 .3	12 3.7

C. What kind of job do you think you will get?

Total	Nothing	Professional	Semi Professional	Managerial	Skilled	Semi Skilled	Unskilled	Undecided	Semi Professional or skilled	N/A
300 100%	1 .3	95 31.7	20 6.7	5 1.7	79 26.3	19 6.3	4 1.3	57 19.0	4 1.3	16 5.3

D. Did you receive any help this summer in picking a job?

Total	A Lot	Some	A Little	None	N/A
300 100%	77 25.7	91 30.3	58 19.3	73 24.3	1 .3

The occupational goals of the enrollees as reported by them were relatively high before the program and are now even higher. Their expectations of what they will actually get are likewise high. The figure that is disproportionately high is the number who expect to obtain professional positions - it is not anticipated that 30% of the jobs in the economy will fall into the professional category.

The last set of data regarding help in selecting a job show that large numbers of enrollees could use further vocational guidance.

E.13 Do the enrollees see school as relevant to occupational goals?

Question to Enrollees:

If you could get the kind of work you want, how much more school do you think you'll need before you'll be ready?

Total	A Great Deal More	A Lot More	Some More	Very Little More	No More Than I Now Have	N/A
300	156	77	52	8	5	2
100%	52.0	25.7	17.3	2.7	1.7	.7

Not much comment is required here. Education is certainly perceived as essential to the achievement of occupational goals.

E.14 What are the attitudes of parents toward enrollees' school plans?

Question to Enrollee:

How do your parents feel about your plans for continuing school?

Total	Mostly Agree With My Plan	Agree With My Plans	Don't Care Either Way	Disagree With My Plans	Strongly Disagree With My Plans	N/A
300	199	82	13	1	1	4
100%	66.3	27.3	4.3	.3	.3	1.0

The enrollees generally plan to continue school. The parents accept these plans, according to the enrollee, and presumably they are interested in their further schooling.

V.2 TEACHER APPRAISALS

A. Questionnaires - Computerized

T.1 What were the characteristics of the teachers?

Race	Total	Negro	White	Puerto Rican	Oriental	Other	N/A
	88	36	44	4	-	-	4
	100%	40.9	50.0	4.5			4.5

Position During Regular Year:	Total	Regular Licensed Teacher	Substitute Teacher	Curriculum Director	Agency Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Other	Guidance Counselor	N/A
	88	62	6	-	5	-	12	2	1
	100%	70.5	6.8		5.7		13.6	2.3	1.0

Degree Held:	Total	A.A. or A.S.	B.A.	B.S.	None	B.Ed.	N/A
	88	2	53	25	6	1	1
	100%	2.3	60.2	28.4	6.8	1.1	1.1

Sex:	Total	Male	Female	N/A
	88	41	45	2
	100%	46.6	51.1	2.3

These data seem self-explanatory. Perhaps the only comments to point out are that the teachers as a group seem qualified, and that the enrollees had more Negro teachers in the summer program than during the regular school year. It should be added that nine of the teachers interviewed had masters degrees. Approximately half of the teachers interviewed were paid by the Board and half of them were paid by the Agencies.

T. 2 What were the characteristics of the teaching operation?

Questions to Teachers:

A. How often was each of the following areas of instruction offered?

	Total	Frequently	Occasionally	Infrequently	Never	N/A
Reading:	88	64	7	7	8	2
	100%	72.7	8.0	8.0	9.1	2.3
Arithmetic:	88	28	28	12	17	3
	100%	31.8	31.8	13.6	19.3	3.4
Other:	47	22	10	3	12	--
	100%	46.8	21.3	2.4	25.5	--

B. To what extent did you relate your instruction to the enrollee's present or future work experience?

Total	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Infrequently	Never	N/A
88	38	21	20	6	2	1
100%	43.2	23.9	22.7	6.8	2.3	1.1

C. In terms of your educational objectives, did you find the crew chief to be:

Total	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Neutral	Mildly Interfering	Very Interfering	N/A
88	47	17	13	1	2	8
100%	53.4	19.3	14.8	1.1	2.3	9.2

D. Did you work with the enrollee (1) in a group setting and (2) on a one-to-one basis?

	Total	N/A	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Group setting:	88	3	23	40	20	2
	100%	3.4	26.1	45.5	22.7	2.3
One-to-one:	88	3	9	23	42	11
	100%	3.4	10.2	26.1	47.7	12.5

The NYC summer institutional program was heavily, although not exclusively, remedial and oriented toward the enrollee's job. There was some teaching of a variety of other subjects. This instruction may be best summarized under the rubric of educational enrichment.

One Agency constituted an exception to this general rule: MFY's program was not basically a remedial program. Consequently, only 19 per cent of the MFY teachers instructed in reading frequently, 28.6 per cent did so infrequently, and 38.1 per cent never did. If MFY had been excluded from the totals, the cast of the program would have been even more heavily remedial.

The majority of teachers considered the crew chief helpful. Only a few thought he got in the way.

Finally, although most of the teaching was conducted in a group setting, there was considerable work on a one-to-one basis.

T.3 How effective was the program generally?

Questions to Teachers:

A. Of all you expected to accomplish this summer, how much were you able to do?

Total	All	A Great Deal	Some	Very Little	Nothing	Unclear Reply	N/A
88	9	40	30	6	1	1	1
100%	10.2	45.5	34.1	6.8	1.1	1.1	1.1

B. Do the enrollees have a greater potential for educational achievement as a result of the NYC program?

Total	Extremely Likely	Rather Likely	Somewhat Likely	Hardly Likely	Not At all Likely	DK	Unclear	N/A
88	22	29	21	3	7	2	3	1
100%	25.0	33.0	23.9	3.4	8.0	2.3	3.4	1.1

C. If your enrollees return to school, how well do you think they will do compared to pupils from the same socio-economic level who might not have attended a NYC summer program?

Total	Much Better	Better	About The Same	Worse	Much Worse	Unable To evaluate	Unclear	N/A
88	10	47	19	1	3	5	3	--
100%	11.4	53.4	21.6	1.1	3.4	5.7	3.4	--

The majority of teachers see the program as having been at least somewhat useful for the great majority of enrollees. These results are in line with the enrollee estimates.

T. 4 Have the attitudes of the enrollees towards school been constructively affected?

Questions to Teachers:

A. Do you think there was a change in the enrollees attitude toward school as a result of his summer NYC experience?

Total	Strong Positive Change	Mild Positive Change	No Change	Mild Unfavorable Change	Strong Unfavorable Change	DK *	Unclear	N/A
88	19	49	13	3		2	2	
100%	21.6	55.7	14.8	3.4		2.3	2.3	

B. What approximate percentage of the enrollees changed their attitude positively as a result of the NYC experience?

Total	100%	75%	50%	25%	None	Unclear	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	7	22	21	14	12	2	9	1
100%	8.0	25.0	23.9	15.9	13.6	2.3	10.2	1.1

C. What approximate percentage of the enrollees changed their attitude negatively as a result of their NYC experience?

Total	100%	75%	50%	25%	None	Unable To Evaluate	Insignificant	N/A
88		1	4	6	66	7	3	1
100%		1.1	4.5	6.8	75.0	8.0	3.4	1.1

* Don't Know

It seems clear from these data that the teachers believed that the enrollees generally feel more favorably about school, although almost 30 per cent of the teachers reported that a minority of the enrollees were so affected. It is conceivable, also, in evaluating these data, that the enrollees started with more favorable attitudes than the teachers estimated and these more favorable attitudes were perceived as developing out of the summer program.

T. 5 What were teacher-enrollee relations like?

Questions to Teacher:

A. How well do you think you got to know each of your enrollees?

Total	Very Well	Well	Hardly got To Know Each and Every One Of Them	Did Not Know Each And Every Enrollee	Some	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	35	40	9	2	1	1	
100%	39.8	45.5	10.2	2.3	1.1	1.1	

B. How did you feel about teaching the enrollees?

Total	Liked Very Much	Liked	No Strong Feeling Either Way	Liked Very Little	Disliked	Does Not Apply	Unable To Evaluate	N/A
88	60	21	1		1	3	1	1
100%	68.2	23.9	1.1		1.1	3.4	1.1	1.1

C. Did you experience discipline problems?

Total	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Unfrequently	Never	N/A
88		1	10	25	52	
100%		1.1	11.4	28.4	59.1	

It seems evident that good relations developed between teacher and enrollees over the short course of the summer program. The teachers liked their job, experienced few discipline problems, and generally got to know the enrollees. More than 85 per cent of the teachers indicate that they knew their enrollees well. This may be compared with data presented previously in which 74 per cent of the enrollees indicated that the teachers knew them well.

T.6 Was there a change in the enrollees' feelings about self and the world?

Questions to Teacher:

> Rate each of the following in terms of the amount of change you observed in the enrollees during the course of the program:

A. Self-Confidence

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	32	41	12	-	-	3	-
100%	36.4	46.6	13.6			3.4	

B. Respect for Others

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	27	39	20	1	-	1	
100%	30.7	44.3	22.7	1.1		1.1	

C. Desire to Improve Self

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	41	34	10	-	-	1	2
100%	46.6	38.6	11.4			1.1	2.2

Eighty-three per cent of the teachers feel there has been at least some gain in self-confidence on the part of the enrollees. These data fit in with the self-reports of the enrollees, 69 per cent of whom indicated they felt at least a little more sure of themselves.

Seventy-five per cent of the teachers indicate an increase in respect for others. Fifty per cent of the enrollees reported that they think more often of what will happen to another person because of what they do. Again the data are in line.

The teachers see the youngsters as desiring to improve themselves. This, again, fits well with the self-reports of enrollees, who, for example, desire to continue their schooling.

T.7 Has there been a change in the work habits and interests of the enrollees?

Question to Teacher:

Rate each of the following in terms of the amount of change you observed in the enrollees during the course of the program:

A. Ability to Finish Task

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	16	36	22	3	1	4	6
100%	18.2	40.9	25.0	3.4	1.1	4.5	6.6

B. Desire to Do One's Best

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	18	43	20	1	1	3	2
100%	20.5	48.9	22.7	1.1	1.1	3.4	2.2

C. Liking for Arithmetic and Reading

Total	Much More	A Little More	About Same	A Little Less	Much Less	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	6	40	35	-	-	3	4
100%	6.8	45.5	39.8			3.4	4.5

The majority of the teachers see the enrollees as having at least a little more ability to finish a task and as having greater willingness to do their best. Barely a majority see them as having a greater liking for arithmetic and reading, and of these less than 7% see the enrollees as having a much greater liking. This view is in contrast with the view of 25% of the enrollees who see themselves now as much more interested in reading.

These data may again be compared with the self-reports of the enrollees, 57% of whom reported that they are now more likely to finish work on a school problem. Also relevant here is the enrollees' indication (52% of them) that they now try harder on school work.

T.8 What were the teachers' perceptions of the enrollees' occupational plans?

Question to Teacher:

A. How would you rate the types of jobs enrollees wanted in terms of their ability?

Total	Realistic	Somewhat Realistic	Somewhat Unrealistic	Not Realistic	Unable To Evaluate	Not Applicable	Unclear Response	N/A
88	32	33	10	6	3	1	1	2
100%	36.4	37.5	11.4	6.8	3.4	1.1	1.1	2.2

B. Did the enrollees ask for information or advice about how to look for a job?

Total	Very Often	Occasionally	Infrequently	Never	Not Applicable	N/A
88	23	35	16	12	-	2
100%	26.1	39.8	18.2	13.6		2.1

C. Did the enrollees ask for information about job training?

Total	Very Often	Occasionally	Infrequently	Never	Not Applicable	N/A
88	29	33	14	9	1	2
100%	33.0	37.5	15.9	10.2	1.1	2.3

D. Did enrollees ask for information about availability of jobs?

Total	Often	Occasionally	Infrequently	Never	Not Applicable	N/A
88	23	35	12	15	1	2
100%	26.1	39.8	13.6	17.0	1.1	2.2

The great majority of teachers felt that the youngsters were much more realistic than not, in relation to the jobs they wanted. About 18% of the teachers felt that they were unrealistic. In comparing their data with the data regarding the occupational choices made by the enrollees themselves, it would appear that a good number are unrealistic.

The data regarding requests for information about jobs, etc., indicates that while jobs may not be a preoccupation of the enrollees, they certainly are concerned about their employment prospects.

T.9 What was the effect of certain administrative factors on teacher morale?

Question to Teacher:

Rate each item below according to the effect
it had on your morale this summer:

A. Physical Facilities

Total	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	Unclear Response	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	21	26	19	8	9	3	1	1
100%	23.9	29.5	21.6	9.1	10.2	3.4	1.1	1.1

B. Payment of Salary

Total	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	Unclear Response	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	14	17	18	6	32	-	1	-
100%	15.9	19.3	20.5	6.8	36.4		1.1	

C. Amount of Time Allotted to Teaching

Total	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	Unclear Response	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	20	29	20	11	4	1	2	1
100%	22.7	33.0	22.7	12.5	4.5	1.1	2.3	1.1

D. Information Regarding the Enrollees

Total	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	Unclear Response	Unable to Evaluate	N/A
88	15	14	30	17	8	2	1	1
100%	17.0	15.9	34.1	19.3	9.1	2.3	1.1	1.1

Most of the teachers were pleased with the physical facilities provided. Significant numbers, however, were neutral or negative. The interpretation of these data is not completely clear. While interviewer reports suggest inadequate facilities in a number of locations, there is evidence indicating that some teachers vetoed schools as appropriate sites for training, preferring job sites. (For example, six teachers at Mobilization for Youth used a school exclusively, and indicated negative feelings about the physical facilities.)

Most teachers regarded the amount of time available for teaching as appropriate. It cannot be determined without doubt, because of the form of the question asked the teachers, whether the 17% who regarded the time allotted negative wanted more time, although this seems the likely interpretation.

More than 28% of the teachers apparently felt they should have more information on the enrollees, while much less than half, about 33%, apparently were satisfied.

TEACHER APPRAISALS (continued)

B. OPEN-END QUESTIONNAIRES

The following represent the answers of various teachers to open-ended questions given to teachers, which were not put into the computer. Samples of teachers' comments follow each question.

What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the NYC program as it is presently organized?

"Provided jobs and more income for the enrollees during the summer."

"Increased self-esteem of the enrollees and helped them develop a more positive self-image."

"Provided hope for the future and indicated that someone cares."

" Broadened the horizons and increased the awareness of the enrollees."

"Provided good teacher-enrollee relationships and gave the enrollees individual attention."

"Strengthened enrollees' academic skills."

"Kept enrollees off streets"(this apparently was meant positively as a relief from the summer doldrums of the past).

One of the teachers characterized the program as bad, but there was no elaboration. These estimates by the teachers of the effective aspects of the program are generally in line with the responses of the enrollees.

How would you go about stimulating more positive attitudes among enrollees towards school in future summer programs?

In evaluating these data it should be remembered that the teachers generally have positive feelings about the program. There was a wide scattering of responses to this question. Some of the more frequent responses were the following:

"Form even smaller groups."

"Provide educational and vocational guidance."

"Use young people with similar backgrounds who made significant progress."

"Show the value of education in today's world."

"Provide more materials for use in teaching."

"Make more trips to expand horizons."

"Give enrollees a better orientation to the program."

"Pay enrollees for their time."

Many teachers had no comments and indicated satisfaction with the program as it is.

What factors prevented you from doing the best possible job in the NYC Program?

"The late start of the program and the ensuing lack of organization and coordination."

"The lack of coordination between the Board and the Agencies."

"The lack of supplies and materials."

"Poor physical facilities."

"The short term of the program."

"More enrollees were needed."

A few teachers noted the negative attitude of youngsters who were forced to come to the educational program.

Finally, a few teachers said there was no factor that interfered with their doing the best possible job.

What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of the NYC Program as it is presently organized?

The teachers responses did not fall into a pattern here. There were more than 50 different categories of responses obtained from the teachers. The largest number of responses fell into a category which might be labelled "Difficulties in Organization and Administration."

Other categories of response follow (only categories not mentioned elsewhere in the report are mentioned here):

"Lack of role definition — teachers."

"Lack of role definition -- enrollees."

"Educational program shouldn't occur at end of work day."

"Need for more one-to-one help."

"Too many chiefs, supervisors, etc."

"The need for orientation programs for teachers, enrollees, crew chiefs, etc."

"NYC - local Agency cooperation lacking."

"Mandatory attendance not enforced."

"Need for more structure in a content area."

It is stressed that these many criticisms came from teachers who for the most part saw the program as essentially effective.

Has the NYC experience changed any of your ideas and/or feeling about youngsters from depressed areas?

The majority of the teachers indicated that their ideas and feelings were not changed, generally because they had previous experience in this area. Their responses generally appeared to be empathic and understanding.

Twenty-nine of the teachers indicated that their attitude had changed, and they now were more understanding, empathic, and had a better appreciation of the enrollees' potential. The quality of their comments was such that there can be confidence that their judgments about themselves may have validity.

Although the teachers who did not change manifested favorable attitudes toward the slum youngsters, there is always the possibility that some may have retained stereotypes or other rigidities which could distort their understandings, and interfere with personal growth. Some people in the program who had experience with slum children stated that they saw things more clearly now.

What have you learned about the enrollees' neighborhood which would be helpful to you during the regular school year?

Thirty-eight of the teachers said that they were familiar with this or similar neighborhoods, and consequently did not learn anything new. There were several no responses. Others gave the following answers:

That they gained a deepened understanding of the children,

That the slum neighborhood contains people who want to help students and teachers,

That they acquired an increased understanding of the neighborhood,

That they learned about the disadvantages of the slums,

That they found they were personally more comfortable in the environment than they thought they would be.

On the other hand, one teacher indicated that what she (he) had learned was to get out before dark, and another stated that work in the area again would not be accepted.

How do you feel the Agency can contribute to the over all education of children?

A few teachers did not respond to this question and others said they did not know. The following comments were among those made by the great majority of teachers who did respond to this question, and who indicated the Agencies could contribute:

"Give the Agencies more space so they can better help children."

"Give the Agencies more supplies and materials."

"Have the Agencies give adolescents jobs and acquaint them with the world of work and its demands."

"By providing a cultural enrichment program."

"By providing more remediation work through tutorial procedures."

"By continuing the present program."

"By continuing the present summer NYC program throughout the year."

"By providing the enrollees with a personal relationship in which they realize that someone cares."

"By helping the enrollees see the value of school."

On the basis of your NYC experience, have you any idea about new methods and approaches for use during the regular school year?

Somewhat more than fifty per cent of the teachers had at least one idea. Generally, their ideas fell into three areas -- manifest more favorable attitudes towards adolescents, use new methods, and use different materials.

The teachers suggestions, in brief, were as follows:

Attitudes

"In teaching teachers, enforce the idea that the problems are with the teachers, the Board, and large classes, not with the students."

"Respect teaching and teenagers."

"Interview and talk with students."

Methods

"Work from present problems back to historical roots."

"Use smaller groups in class."

"Present more science and math."

"Teach reading along with history."

"Relate reading and math to kids' experiences and teach in terms of job orientation."

"Use role playing and sociodrama."

"Use more student-centered activities, encourage participation by all class members -- not so much lecturing."

Materials

"Teach Negro and Puerto Rican history and further understanding of, and pride in, ethnic backgrounds."

"Use more trips and more cultural enrichment activities in a more flexible and varied program."

"Utilize films, newspapers, current books, career guidance books, and books and magazines about hobbies."

VI. EDUCATIONAL DIRECTORS' APPRAISALS

The interviews with the Educational Directors of the Agencies were conducted chiefly to obtain background and interview data and to establish relationships between them and the Center for Urban Education. Six Educational Directors were interviewed in five Agencies. In one Agency, the Educational Director was on vacation and two people who worked with that official were interviewed. In another, a Summer Research Director was interviewed. There follows data pertinent to the evaluation.

How would you rate your relations with Board personnel?

	Very Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
Teachers	2	4	1	-	2
Curriculum Specialists	2	1	1	-	2
Area Supervisors	2	1	1	2	1
Central Office	1	4	-	-	1

On balance, this is positive, although it is mixed.

Perhaps the best way of communicating the flavor of these responses is by reviewing some sample interview notes, which now follow.

Question 18. What role did the Board of Education play in the educational program at the Agency?

Answers: "Cooperating teachers did not know tasks - speed of initiating program resulted in vagueness. The Curriculum Specialists which the Board of Education hired were inadequate to the work."

"Only paid the teachers. One Curriculum Specialist is very good."

"Initial role only remedial - Board of Education accepted accord of Agency."

"Initially, the teachers were in charge - now cleared up."

"Half of teaching staff; Curriculum Specialists, some suppliers, exchange of ideas related to program."

"Provided personnel. Supplies - extremely hampered by red tape. Equipment - availability limited."

"In accord with the Neighborhood Youth Corps program - Board of Ed. program leaned toward remedial work."

In evaluating Agency-Board relations, there was evidence of some hostility and some contempt in four of the above responses. These responses make it clear that the Agency program was paramount.

Question 20. What parts of the program would you want to remain as is?

"Using young people to make contact with enrollees - need to improve reading is forced by enrollees - prime importance.

"Flexibility"

"Cultural enrichment (plays, speakers, fishing trips, etc.)"

"Class size (under 10 students). Preserve the cooperative discipline and attitudes of pupil and teacher - continue homogeneous grouping."

"Keep objectives flexible - teachers thrown on own resources are quite creative. -Continue Board of Education freedom to structure program according to agency needs. Teachers should be selected after screening by agency."

"The functions of the program should remain the same."

"Basic should remain - job experience plus education."

Of what value would you say the summer program has been to the enrollees?

Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative
2	3	2	-	-

The ratings are quite favorable.

VII. Curriculum Specialist's Appraisals

Salient points from the interviewer's with the Curriculum Specialists follow.

Experience and training-- No requirements for training and experience for these personnel were established at the time of hiring. Flexibility and energy apparently were the chief requirements. Whether this worked out is not certain. As indicated, the evaluations of the Curriculum Specialists by the Agency personnel were mixed.

Overall, how much would you say, as curriculum specialist, were you able to contribute to the program?

Very Much	Same	A Little	Nothing
6	4	1	

One, and perhaps 4 more, may be a little doubtful about their contributions.

In your judgment, how much do you feel the enrollees got out of the program?

A Whole Lot	Same	A Little	Nothing
4	6		

One person refused to make a judgment because there was such variation from site to site.

The judgment here is similar to that of other personnel in the program. The enrollees got something.

How would you describe your relationships with the agency?

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
7	2	2		

It would appear, judging from the Agency responses, that a few of these people have miscalculated.

Describe your relationship with Board of Education teacher.

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	None
8	2				1

Describe your relationship with the agency teacher.

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	None
6	2	1			2

Relationships with agency teachers and Board teachers were on a par. One Curriculum Specialist had no relationship with the agency teachers (the other was in the office of the Program Coordinator).

Would you come back to the program next year?

Yes	No
10	1

One of the ten saying "yes" would not want the same position.

Two suggestions for improving the program were advanced by Curriculum Specialists which have not yet appeared in this report:

Identify those teachers with special talents and make them available widely.

Set up Curriculum Specialists as assistants to the Area Supervisors (with some supervising powers).

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The Neighborhood Youth Corps educational enrichment program during the summer of 1966 achieved its objectives to a significant degree. Seventy-five to eighty per cent of the enrollees were constructively affected.

(1) Enrollees have received tutoring in arithmetic, reading, and other subjects in which they needed help.

(2) Their attitudes twoards school improved. The schools have available to them a reservoir of constructive motivation which they can tap.

(3) The enrollees increased their appreciation of the need for additional schooling, if their vocational goals are to be reached.

(4) Attitudes of enrollees towards self and society were constructively affected. Perhaps the flavor of this accomplishment may be best communicated by invoking the concept of the achievement of a sense of identity. The adolescent who is fortunate enough to achieve a sense of identity emerges into adulthood with some inkling of where he has been and where he is going. In this culture at this time, it is most important that the disadvantaged adolescent come to believe and feel that the social order contains identifiable vocational niches into which he could conceivably fit. Perhaps more than anything else, the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer educational program provided the enrollees with hope -- hope that there was an accepting social and economic order which would welcome them and which had a place for them. The enrollees understand that this welcome is conditional and dependent upon the completion of scho-

lastic training and the achievement of certain skills. They seem ready to spend the required time and energy.

It is emphasized that the feeling of identity, and the sense of self-respect which must accompany and provide a base for the sense of identity, require continuous reinforcement. Consequently, the experiences the enrollees have during the school year likewise must be ego strengthening and skill building. The school and Agency personnel with whom they interact must demonstrate faith in, and respect for, their potential as well as teachability. Otherwise it may be predicted that the ultimate outcome for these youngsters will be dreary and disillusioning.

Recommendations

(1) We must reiterate the obvious: surely it is possible to facilitate the purchase and delivery of supplies, curriculum materials, etc. When materials do not become available for distribution until the end of the program, the Board obviously provides ammunition to its critics. The same point can be made with reference to the payment of employee salaries, which were not received until the end of the program.

(2) There is a glaring need for planning, before getting underway next summer. The personnel who are to be responsible for next summer's program should be designated immediately, and these people should determine when planning should start. The experience of last summer should facilitate the necessary planning.

(3) The role of the Board of Education in relation to the Agencies should be clearly defined. As indicated, this was not at all clear in the initial phases of the program. The Agencies ultimately provided the necessary

professional leadership and Board personnel were in the position of implementing Agency programs. This was not a result of the default of Board personnel; far from it. It was a consequence of Agency insistence and the flexibility of Board personnel.

(4) Arrangements should be made, if possible, to provide the Agencies with the data on enrollees which they require. It is not economical for the Agencies to have to determine reading achievement levels, etc., when these data are already available in the schools. It is realized that this conclusion is drawn without providing procedures for implementation. An aid to implementation would be the early identification of the potential enrollees.

(5) Personnel in the program, both Agency and Board, are competent and well motivated. However, the qualifications of the Curriculum Specialists should be carefully reviewed, since a number of them did not appear to have appropriate experience.

(6) Some feedback should be provided for reporting to their home school the achievement of the enrollees in the summer program, so that in September 1966 and thereafter the home schools can build upon said program. Some enrollees will need further vocational guidance in fitting their present and future aspirations to their ability to meet the demands of the vocations in which they say they are interested.

Appendix A. Evaluation Staff

Research Director:

Dr. Bernard Peck, Associate Professor of Education, The City College of the City University of New York, formerly Psychologist with the Center for Youth and Community Studies (Bakers Dozen Mental Hygiene Unit), Washington, D.C.

Associate Research Directors:

Dr. Max Weiner, Associate Professor of Education and Coordinator of Graduate Program in Guidance and School Counseling, Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

Mrs. Marcella Williams, M.S., Senior Consultant, Educational Resources Center, Bank Street College of Education, New York

Consultants:

Mrs. Hildegard Berman, Research Psychologist, Columbia University, New York (on leave)

Mr. Kenneth M. Brelesky, M.S., Research Assistant, Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education, The City University of New York

Miss Judith E. Garrettson, M.A., Doctoral Candidate, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York and formerly Research Assistant, Logical Thinking Project, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

Mr. Steven J. Gross, Doctoral Candidate, University of Cincinnati and formerly Fellow, Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education, The City University of New York

Mrs. Ruth A. Handy, M.A., formerly teacher and School-Community Coordinator, Office of Assistant Superintendent, Districts 25 and 27, Brooklyn, New York

Mr. Allan K. Kondo, M.S., Part-time Instructor in Science Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

Mrs. Anita Levine, M.S., Lecturer, Guidance and Counseling Program, Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

Dr. Janet E. Lieberman, Reading Specialist and Instructor, Department of Education, Hunter College, The City University of New York

Evaluation Staff (continued)

Mr. Edwin Reisfeld, Candidate for Master of Arts in Psychology, Queens College of the City University of New York and formerly Activity Group Therapist, Hudson Guild Counseling Center, New York

Mrs. Elizabeth G. Remba, Administrative Assistant, Social Dynamics Research Institute, The City College of the City University of New York

Mr. Sterling E. Rogers, M.A., Curriculum Materials Specialist and Manager of Resources Center, Bank Street College of Education, New York

Mr. Paul C. Ross, M.S., Research Assistant, Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education, The City University of New York

Miss Diane Siegel, M.S., formerly Subject Specialist, Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, Yeshiva University, New York and Assistant Teacher, Project Head Start, New York

Dr. Marvin Siegelman, Assistant Professor, The School of Education, The City College of the City University of New York

Mr. Preston E. Smith, M.A., Teaching Assistant, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York and Doctoral Candidate in Personnel Psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York

Mr. Charles A. Sukman, M.S., Adjunct Associate Professor of Education in Guidance and Counseling, C.W. Post College, Long Island University, New York

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Questionnaire for Project Coordinator

I. I'd Like to know a little about the history of the program from your point of view. How did you get involved? Did you make policy, or did you make it in consultation with anyone on a higher level?

II. Was there time for planning?

III. What did you see as the objectives of the program and how did you see your role in achieving these objectives? Did your conception of your role change? How well were these objectives achieved?

IV. What did you see as the Area Supervisors' role? Did their role change?

V. What did you see as the role of the Board of Education teachers, particularly in relation to the agency teachers?

VI. What kinds of teachers did you employ? What were the criteria utilized?

VII. What did you see as the role of the agencies? Did this change? What were your channels of communication with the agencies?

VIII. What were your relations with the agency like (by agency & generally).

Rate and explain.

IX. Would you tell me about the orientation meeting held in June? (later)
What was the role of the agencies?

X. What problems came up and what did you do about them?

XI. What happened in the instances of supplies, curriculum material, audio-visual equipment, which were reported frequently as not available? What about salaries?

XIII Do you think that the enrollee has changed his attitude towards school positively or negatively? (Explain and give examples.)

XIV. Do you feel the agencies can contribute to the overall education of children and youth Explain.

IV. Would the education of children be enchanced if the schools and agencies cooperated more closely?

XVI. What do you think are the most valuable contribution of the N.Y.C. Program as it is presently organized?

XVII. What factors prevented you from doing the best possible job in the N.Y.C. Program?

XVIII What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of the NYC Program as it is presently organized?

XIX. Has the NYC experience changed any of your ideas and/or feelings about youngsters from depressed areas. (Explain)

XX. On the basis of your NYC experience have you any ideas about new methods or approaches that you plan to use during the regular school year If yes what are they?

XXI. What other general impressions have you of the NYC Program that have not been covered and which you feel ought to be mentioned?

XXII. Would you want to return to work in the NYC Program next summer?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Area Supervisor

1. a) Name
   b) Age c) Sex M. F.
   d) Race N. W.

2. Where are you employed during the regular school year and what do you do?

3. Post high school education:
   a) Where? b) Major_________
   c) Degree_________
   d) No college degree
   e) No. of credits?_________

4. Tell me what your work consists of in the summer program

5. What were your objectives with respect to the program?

6. Do you think that your objectives were achieved?

   Extremely likely_________

   Rather likely___________

   Somewhat likely_________

   Hardly likely___________

   Not at all_____________

Title I Evaluation
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Area Supervisor

7. What was the date which classes actually began?

8. Rate the availability of each of the items below on this scale

    1. _____readily available
    2. _____available after delay
    3. _____not available
    4. _____had to supply my own

    _____supplies, pencils, paper, crayons, etc.

    _____curriculum materials

    _____audiovisual equipment

9. How well do you think you got to know each of your teachers?

    1. _____very well
    2. _____well
    3. _____hardly got to know each and everyone
    4. _____did not know each and every teacher

9 a) How well did the teachers do their jobs?

Agency teacher ___Excellent ___Good ___Fair ___Poor

Cooperating teachers Bd. ___Excellent ___Good ___Fair ___Poor

Title I Evaluation
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Area Supervisor

10. Rate each item below according to the effect it had on the effectiveness of the educational program

1. very positive
2. positive
3. neutral
4. negative
5. very negative

_____Physical facilities

_____payment of salary

_____amount of time allotted for teaching

_____information regarding the enrollees

11. Do you think the educational program was more suitable or appropriate for:

	Extremely Suitable	Rather Suitable	Somewhat Suitable	Hardly Suitable	Not at all Suitable
a) Male enrollees	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b) Female enrollees	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. In terms of your educational objectives, did you find the Crew Chief to be:

1. very helpful _____
2. somewhat helpful _____
3. neutral _____
4. mildly interfering _____
5. very interfering _____

Title I Evaluation
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Area Supervisor

13. As a result of your experiences in the summer program in N.Y.C. do you think your enrollees have greater potential for educational achievement than you thought they had.

____yes ____no (Explain)

13 a) Do you think there was a change in the enrollee's attitude toward school as a result of his summer N.Y.C. experience?

1. Strong positive change ____
2. Mild positive change ____
3. No change ____
4. Mild unfavorable change ____
5. Strong unfavorable change ____

14. How often was each of the following instructions offered?

	1) frequently	2) occasionally	3) infrequently	4) never
a)reading	________	__________	__________	____
b)arithmetic	________	__________	__________	____
c)other(specify)	______	__________	__________	____

15. How would you have preferred to have the educational enrichment program structured?

1. Reserve one day out of five for all the instructions ____
2. Scheduling the tutorial periods before, after or in between the work assignment ____
3. Other (Specify) ____

16. How would you go about stimulating more positive attituded among enrollees towards school in future summer programs.

Title I Evaluation
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Area Supervisor

17. If you believe that the enrollee has changed his attitude toward school because of his N.Y.C. experience positively or negatively, please give examples of such changes.

17 a) What have your relations with the agencies been like (Explain)

___Excellent ___Good ___Eair ___Poor

17 b) Do you feel that agencies can contrmbute to the overall education of children? (Explain)

Yes___ No___

17 c) Wpuld the education of children be enhanced if the schools and agencies cooperated more closely? (Explain)

18. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the N.Y.C. program as it is presently organized?

19. What factors prevented you from doing the best possible job in the N.Y.C. program?

20. What do you consider to be the major weakness of the N.Y.C. program as it is presently organized?

21. Has the N.Y.C. experience changed any of your ideas and/or feelings about youngsters from depressed areas?

Yes_____ No_____

if yes, how?

Title I Evaluation
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Area Supervisor

22. On the basis of your N.Y.C. experience, have you any ideas about new methods or approaches that you plan to use during the regular school year?

Yes_____ No_____

if yes, what are they?

23. What other general impressions have you of the N.Y.C. program that have not been covered above which you feel ought to be mentioned.

24. Would you want to return to work for the N.Y.C. next summer?

1. Yes_____
2. No_____
3. Can't say at this time_____

Why or why not?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Questionnaire for Curriculum Specialists

1. Agency

2. Age 3. Sex M____ F____

4. Position during regular school year

5. Where employed

6. Number of years experience in curriculum____

7. Number of years experience in related work____ (What was related work?)

8. What were your assignments in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program this summer?

9. In what ways did your assignments differ from what you had expected them to be when you began your work? (Explain)

10. To what extent were you able to obtain all the materials you required?

___not at all ___some ___most ___all (Explain)

11. Overall, how much would you say, as a curriculum specialist, were you able to contribute to the program? (Explain)

___very much ___some ___a little ___nothing

12. What changes would you suggest for next year's program?

13. In your judgment, how much do you feel the enrollees got out of the program? (Explain basis for judgment)

___a whole lot ___some ___a little ___nothing at all

14. How would you describe your relationship with the agency?

___very good ___fair ___poor
___good ___very poor

15. Describe your relationship with the Board of Education teachers.

___very good ___fair ___poor
___good ___very poor

16. Describe your relationship with the Agency teachers

___very good ___fair ___poor
___good ___very poor

17. Would you come back to the program next year?

yes___ no___

18. Is there anything you would like to add which has not been covered so far?

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Questionnaire for Curriculum Specialists

19. Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the teachers?

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Agency					
Bd. of Ed.					

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street/ New York, N. Y. 10036

EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES DIVISION

August 15th, 1966 Title I Evaluations

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is concerned with the Center for Urban Education Neighborhood Youth Corps Educational Enrichment Program. All information obtained will be kept strictly confidential. Only Board of Education personnell should respond.

1 a) name______________________ b) Agency______________
(last name) (first name)

c) Age________ d Sex M F e) Race N W

2. Position: a) Regular Licensed Teacher__________

b) Substitute Teacher __________

c) Curriculum Director __________

d) Agency Teacher __________

e) Supervising Teacher __________

f) Other (specify) __________

3. For how many years have you been a teacher?__________________

4. Where are you employed during the regular school year______________

5. Post High School education: a) Where?______________________

b) Major______________ c) Degree (BA, AA, BS, etc.) ______________

d) No college degree____________

6. Graduate education: a) Where?________________________ b)Degree

__________________ c) No. of credits?______________________

7. a) Total number of enrollees in your group:________ b) Number of

males:________

7. (continued)

c) Number of females:________________________

8. a) Age range of all enrollees:_________________b) Age range of males:

_______________________ c) Age range of females:_______________________

d) Ages of most enrollees:_________________________

9. What percentage of your group is currently in regular school?

____

10. How did you learn about the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices

Neighborhood Youth Corps Educational Enrichment Program

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What have you been doing in the summer program?
Of all you expected to accomplish this summer, how much were you able to do?

1. All ____
2. A great deal ____
3. Some ____
4. Very little ____
5. Nothing ____

2. Rate the availability of each of the items below on this scale:

1 = readily available
2 = available after delay
3 = not available
4 = had to supply on my own

____ Supplies - pencil, paper, crayons, etc.
____ Curriculum materials
____ Audiovisual equipment

3. Rate the availability of each of the items below on this scale:

1 = readily available
2 = available after delay
3 = not available

____ Instructions as to duties of teacher
____ Help with control of enrollees
____ Assistance in teaching

4. To what extent did you relate your instruction to the enrollees' present or future work experience?

1. Always ____
2. Usually ____
3. Sometime ____
4. Infrequently ____
5. Never ____

5. How well do you think you got to know each of your enrollees?

1. Very well ____
2. Well ____
3. Hardly got to know each and every one ____
4. Did not know each and every enrollee ____

6. How did you feel about teaching the enrollees?

1. Liked very much ____
2. Liked ____
3. No strong feeling either way ____
4. Liked very little
5. Disliked

7. Rate each item below according to the effect it had on your morale this summer.

1 = very positive
2 = positive
3 = neutral
4 = negative
5 = very negative

____ Physical facilities
____ Payment of salary
____ Amount of time allotted for teaching
____ Information regarding the enrollees

8. Did you work with the enrollee?

	1) Always	2) Usually	3) Sometimes	4) Never
a) on a 1 to 1 basis	____	____	____	____
b) in a group setting	____	____	____	____

9. Do you think the educational program was more suitable or appropriate for:

	1) Extremely Suitable	2) Rather Suitable	3) Somewhat Suitable	4) Hardly Suitable	5) Not at all Suitable
a) Male enrollees	____	____	____	____	____
b) Female enrolees	____	____	____	____	____

10. In terms of your educational objectives, did you find the crew chief to be:

1. Very helpful ____
2. Somewhat helpful ____
3. Neutral ____
4. Mildly interfering ____
5. Very interfering ____

11. Rate each of the following in terms of the amount of change you observed in the enrollees during the course of the program. Please use this scale:

1 = much more
2 = little more
3 = about same
4 = a little less
5 = much less

____Self confidence
____Respect for others
____Ability to finish task
____Willingness to do ones best
____Desire to improve self
____Liking for arithmetic and reading
____Competence in reading and arithmetic
____Other (Specify)

12. Did the enrollee ask for information or advice about:

	1) Very often	2) Occasionally	3) Infrequently	4) Never
a) Job training	____	____	____	____
b) How to look for a job	____	____	____	____
c) Availability of jobs	____	____	____	____

13. As a result of the summer program in N.Y.C., do you think your enrollees have greater potential for educational achievement than they have shown to date?

1. Extremely likely ____
2. Rather likely ____
3. Somewhat likely ____
4. Hardly likely ____
5. Not at all likely ____

14. Do you think there was a change in the enrollee's attitude toward school as a result of his summer N.Y.C. experience?

1. Strong Positive Change ____
2. Mild Positive Change ____
3. No Change ____
4. Mild Unfavorable Change ____
5. Strong Unfavorable Change ____

15. What approximate percentage of the enrollees changed their attitudes toward school positively as a result of their N.Y.C. experience?

1. 100% ____
2. 75% ____
3. 50% ____
4. 25% ____
5. None ____

16. What approximate percentage of the enrollees changed their attitudes negatively as a result of their N.Y.C. experience?

1. 100% ____
2. 75% ____
3. 50% ____
4. 25% ____
5. None ____

17. If your enrollees return to school, how well do you think they will do compared to pupils from the same socio-economic level who might not have attended a N.Y.C. summer program?

1. Much better ____
2. Better ____
3. About the same ____
4. Worse ____
5. Much worse ____

18. Do you think the kind of jobs the enrollees wanted were:

1. Realistic in terms of their ability ____
2. Somewhat realistic in terms of their ability ____
3. Somewhat unrealistic interms of their ability ____
4. Not realistic in terms of their ability ____

19. How often was each of the following instruction offered:

	1) Frequently	2) Occasionally	3) Infrequently	4) Never
a) Reading	____	____	____	____
b) Arithmetic	____	____	____	____
c) Other (Specify)	____	____	____	____

20. How would you have preferred to have the educational enrichment program structured?

    1. Reserve one day out of five for all the instruction ____
    2. Scheduling the tutorial periods before, after or in-between the work assignment ____
    3. Other (specify) ____

21. Did you experience any discipline problems?

    1. Very often ____
    2. Often ____
    3. Occasionally ____
    4. Infrequently ____
    5. Never ____

22. How would you go about stimulating more positive attitudes among enrollees towards school in future summer programs?

23. If you believe that the enrollee has changed his attitude toward school because of his N.Y.C. experience, positively or negatively, please give examples of such changes.

24. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the N.Y.C. program as it is presently organized?

25. What factors prevented you from doing the best possible job in the N.Y.C. program?

26. What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of the N.Y.C. program as it is presently organized?

27. Has the N.Y.C. experience changed any of your ideas and/or feelings about youngsters from depressed areas?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, how?

28. Were you able to make use of the enrollees' work experience in your instruction?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, describe:

29. Have you used any methods with your enrollees that you thought were especially useful for them?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, list them.

30. On the basis of your N.Y.C. experience, have you any ideas about new methods or approaches that you plan to use during the regular school year?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, what are they?

31. What other general impressions have you of the N.Y.C. program that have not been covered above which you feel ought to be mentioned?

32. Would you want to return to work for the N.Y.C. next summer?

1. Yes _____
2. No _____
3. Can't say at this time _____

Why or why not?

33. How do you feel the agency can contribute to the overall education of children?

34. Would the education of children be enhanced if the schools and agencies cooperated more closely?

Explain:

35. What have you learned about the enrollee's neighborhood which would be helpful to you in your teaching during the regular school year?

36. If you experienced discipline problems, what were they?

37. If you were faced with displine problems, how did you deal with the problem?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street/New York, N.Y. 10036
Educational Practices Division

August 15, 1966 Title I Evaluation

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ENROLLEES

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

1. Agency ______________________________

2. Age _______________ Sex M_____ F _____

3. Grade in school ________ Siblings ____________ Place in family (#)________

4. Name of School ________________________________ Borough ________________

5. How do you feel about the school part of this summer program?

1. very satisfied ________________		3. not satisfied ___________	
2. satisfied ________________		4. very unsatisfied ________	

6. Has the amount of reading you do changed this summer?

1. do much more ________________	4. little less ____________
2. do a little more ______________	5. much less ____________
3. same as before ________________	

7. If you were paid for the time you spent in the school part of the program, do you feel you

   1. would have learned more _________
   2. would have learned about the same _________
   3. would have learned less _________
   4. would have learned much less _________

8. Below are listed a number of things which you ve done this summer. Number them in the order you liked to do them. Put a 1 before the one liked most; a 2 before the second best, etc.

________ read

________ do arithmetic

________ work on a job

________ work with other people

9. Did your feelings about the school part of the program change over the summer?

1. much more favorable ________
2. more favorably ________
3. about the same ________
4. less favorably ________
5. much less favorably ________

10. Were there teacher aides and/or volunteers in the school program? ________
If yes, did the teacher aides help you learn in the school program?

1. helped a lot ________
2. helped a little ________
3. helped almost never ________
4. never helped ________

11. Of the following, what do you think is the best reason for going to school this summer?

1. to earn more money on a job ________
2. to be able to understand what is going on in the world and city better ________
3. to be able to live a happier life ________
4. to like art, music, literature more ________
5. to keep me off the street ________

12. Of the following, how often do you read each?

1 = very often

2 = often

3 = sometimes

4 = seldom

5 = never

sports stories ________

newspapers ________

adventure stories ________

science stories ________

stories of the lives of great men ________

comic books ________

none of these ________

13. Why did you go to the school part of the summer program?

1. Had to go in order to be paid ____
2. I wanted to go ____
3. My parents wanted me to go ____
4. My friends went ____
5. I had nothing else to do ____
6. Other (specify) ____

14. If you could get the kind of work you want, how much more school do you think you'll need before you'll be ready?

1. A great deal more ____
2. A lot more ____
3. some more ____
4. very little more ____
5. no more than I now have ____

15. List the following in the order you would like. (1 = the most liked, 2 = the next most, etc.)

To go back to school ____
To go into the Armed Forces ____
To go to work full time ____
To go into the job corps ____

16. Did you feel you got any help this summer in picking a job for yourself when you finish school?

1. A lot ____
2. Some ____
3. A little ____
4. None ____

17. Do you talk about your day at thie NYC when you go home?

1. very often ____
2. often ____
3. sometimes ____
4. Seldom ____
5. Never ____

18. How do you feel about telling others that you attend NYC?

1. I tell anyone who will listen ____
2. I tell only if I am asked ____
3. I try to avoid telling anyone ____
4. I don't tell anyone ____

19. Who told you about NYC Program?

1. School ____
2. Guidance teacher ____
3. Regular teacher ____
4. Someone at a social agency ____
5. Friend ____
6. minister ____
7. Other (specify)

20. How much help will the school work you have done this summer be to you when you get to regular school?

1. a great deal ____________
2. a lot ____________
3. some ____________
4. very little ____________
5. none ____________

21. Did your feeling about school change this summer because of the NYC program?

1. Feel much better about learning ________
2. Feel better __________
3. Feel the same _________
4. Feel worse about learning _______
4. Feel much worse about learning _____

22. How did you feel about regular achool?

1. Liked it very much ___________
2. Liked it ____________
3. No feeling either way _________
4. Disliked it a little __________
5. Disliked it a lot ____________

23. How would you feel about regular school if it were just like the summer school program?

1. Like it very much ____________
2. Like it ___________
3. No feeling either way _________
4. Would dislike it a little _______
5. Would dislike it a lot ___________

24. Do you try harder now on your school work than you did before the summer program

1. Much harder _________
2. Harder ____________
3. Same ______________
4. Less hard ____________
5. Don't try at all ________

25. When you start working on a school problem now, what happens?

ly
1. More like to finish it than before summer program ____________
2. More likely to finish it than before summer program ____________
3. Just as likely to finish it than before summer program _________
4. Less likely to finish it than before summer program ___________
5. Much less likely to finish it than before summer program __________

26. How did you feel about your teacher this summer?

1. Liked a lot __________
2. Liked a little ________
3. No feeling ___________
4. Didn't like too much __________
5. Didn't like at all ___________

27. How often did your teacher help you with your school work this summer?

1. Very often ________
2. Often _________
3. Sometimes _________
4. Seldom ___________
5. Never ____________

28. Did your teacher this summer help you with the kind of school work you do in school this fall?

1. a great deal ___________
2. some help ___________
3. little help __________
4. no help ______________

29. How well do you think the teacher knows you?

1. very well __________
2. well __________
3. Hardly knew me __________
4. did not know me at all __________

30. How did you feel about asking this teacher questions?

1. always easy to ask ________
2. most of the time easy to ask ________
3. sometimes easy to ask _______
4. Most of the time hard to ask ______
5. Always hard to ask _________

31. Did you feel that you could do the school work given you this summer?

1. always ________
2. often _________
3. Sometimes ______
4. Seldom __________
5. Never ___________

32. If you could pick your teacher during the school year, of the following, whom would you pick?

1. Regular school teacher _____
2. Summer school teacher ______
3. Crew chief ___________
4. None ______________

33. Have your plans for continuing school been changed in any way as a result of the summer program?

1. Now, much more likely to stay ________
2. Now more ________
3. Not changed - still will stay ________
4. Now less likely to stay. ________
5. Now much less likely to stay. ________
6. Not changed - still will leave or not return to school ________

34. Do you think about what will happen to another person because of what you do?

1. Much more now than before summer program ________
2. More now than before summer program ________
3. Same as before ________
4. Less now than before summer program. ________
5. Much less than before summer program ________

35. Did you change in how hard you try in your schoolwork as a result of summer school?

1. try much harder ________
2. try a little harder ________
3. about the same ________
4. try less ________
5. try much less ________

36. Did the way you feel about yourself change after being in the program this summer?

1. feel much more sure of myself ________
2. Feel a little more sure of self ________
3. Feel about the same ________
4. Less sure of self ________
5. Much less sure of self ________

37. Did the way you want to get ahead in life change because of the summer program?

Want to get ahead much more.________________

Want to get ahead more.____________________

Want to get ahead about the same.______________

Want to get ahead less.______________________

Want to get ahead much less._________________

38. Rank the people with whom you worked this summer according to how much they helped you. (Put a 1 before the one who helped you the most; a 2 before the one who helped you second, etc.)

_______________crew chief

_______________teacher

______________ friends in NYC

_____________family

______________Persons connected with a religious group

_____________Persons connected with a political group

39. Of all the people you have met as a result of the NYC program, whom would you most want to be like. (Rank most to least--1 - most, 2 - next most, etc.)

_____________Teacher

____________Crew chief

______________Teacher aid, or volunteer

_____________Someone from group

____________ Someone from community agency

____________Other (specify)

40. How do your parents feel about your plans for continuing school?

1.________________Mostly agree with my plans

2.________________ Agree with my plans

3.________________Don't care either way

4.________________Disagree with my plans

5.________________Strongly disagree with my plans

41. Did the way you feel about people in authority change because of the program this summer?

A. Like people much more____________________

B. Like people more________________________

C. Same_________________________________

D. Like people less_______________________

E. Like people much less__________________

41A. What have you been doing in the summer program? (answer on back)

42. How much like your regular school teacher was the teacher you had this summer?

1._____________Much better

2._____________Just as good

3.___________ Almost as good

4.___________ Not as good

5._____________Much worse

Why?____

____

43. Has someone given you advice about work? Who?_____________________

Did you take it?____

Why or why not?____

44. What did you expect to learn this summer?______________________________

____

How much of it did you learn?

1. All of it.______________________

2. A lot of it.______________________

3. Some of it.______________________

4. A little of it.__________________

5. None of it.______________________

45. What kind of work did you want to do before you came into the NYC program?

What kind of work would you like to do when you finish school?

What kind of work do you think you will get when you finish school?

46. Next summer would you want to come back to the NYC program?

1.Yes____________

2. Maybe_________

3. No______________

What changes would you suggest?

47. Were you satisfied with the program? Why or Why Not ________________________

____

____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Questionnaire For Enrollees

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Agency____________

A. Age_____ B. Sex: ☐ male ☐ female

C. Grade in school this September______________________________

D. Number of brothers__________________
Number of sisters__________________

1. Who told you about the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program? (check proper box)

☐ Someone at school
☐ Guidance teacher
☐ Regular school teacher
☐ Someone at social agency
☐ Friend
☐ Minister
☐ Other (who)__________________

2. How do you feel about the school part of the program? (check one box only)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1	2	3	4	5
very satisfied	satisfied	no feelings either way	not satisfied	very satisfied

3. How well do you think your teacher this summer knew you? (check one)

☐	☐	☐	☐
very well	well	hardly knew me	did not know me at all

3 a) This summer at school I learned:

a lot	some	very little	nothing at all
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Do you feel more or less confident about handling your schoolwork this fall because of the summer program? (check one)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
a lot more confident	a little more confident	no change	a little less confident	a lot less confident

5. Have your feelings about your future changed because of the summer school program? (check one box)

future will be a lot better ☐
future will be a little better ☐

future will be the same ☐
future a little worse ☐
future a lot worse ☐

6. Has the amount of reading you do changed this summer?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1	2	3	4	5
do much more	do a little more	same as before	little less	much less

7. How often do you talk about the Neighborhood Youth Corps when you are around home? (check one)

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
1	2	3	4	5
very often	often	sometimes	seldom	never

8. For which of the following do you feel **best** prepared as a result of summer school? (check one)

☐ Regular school
☐ Full time work
☐ Job Corps
☐ Going into the armed service
☐ Other (which)__________________
☐ None

9. How do you feel about each of the following people from the summer program? (check one)

Teacher	☐ liked a lot	☐ liked a little	☐ no feelings either way	☐ didn't like too much	☐ didn't like at all
Crew Chief	☐ liked a lot	☐ liked a little	☐ no feelings either way	☐ didn't like too much	☐ didn't like at all

10. What did you like best about the program?

11. What did you dislike most about the program?

12. If you were the teacher, what changes would you make in the program?

13. Would you want to come back to the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program next year? (check one)

☐ yes

☐ maybe

☐ no

14. How often have you attended classes? (check one)

☐ all the time

☐ most of the time

☐ half of the time

☐ once in a while

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Name of Interviewer________________________________

Agency________________________________

Site________________________________

Date____________________

Interviewers Questionnaire

1. Please rate the enrollees' readiness to respond to the questionnaire.

_________ Very cooperative.
_________ Cooperative
_________ Neutral
_________ Reluctant
_________ Very reluctant.

2. Please rate the enrollees' ability to follow the instructions in the questionnaire (group).

_________ Easy
_________ Some difficulty.
_________ Very Difficult.

3. What is your assessment of the honesty of the responses by the enrollees?

_________ Generally honest.
_________ Some faking.
_________ Generally dishonest.
_________ Don't know.

4. Were the facilities for the conduct of the interview adequate?

_____yes _____no If no, please explain.

5. Please rate the cooperativeness of the teacher during the teacher interview.

_________ Very cooperative.
_________ Cooperative
_________ Neutral
_________ Mildly reluctant.
_________ Very reluctant.

6. Please rate the cooperativeness of the teacher in arranging for interviews with enrollees, and in general arrangements for the administration of the questionneire.

__________Very cooperative.
__________Cooperative
__________Neutral
__________Mildly reluctant.
__________Very reluctant.

7. Is there any information, or did you make any observations of anything which you feel should be reported, and which has not been indicated elsewhere?

8. Please note any impressions you may have formed regarding the program at this site and its effectiveness?

9. Other: (please use this space for elaborations - if any - of the above, or for any other comments you would like to make.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Anecdotal Record of Classroom Procedure

1. Interviewer
2. Agency
3. Site (location)
4. Number of enrollees
5. Physical description of site

6. Materials in use or available?

7. Materials not available?

8. If observing teaching aide, what is her rating of the quality of the direction provided by the cooperating teacher? Explain

Excellent____ Good____ Fair____ Poor ____

What were the teacher's objective's for lesson observed?

2.

9. Date and time

10. Anecdotal record (10 - 15 minutes)

11. Were the teacher's objectives for the lesson achieved?

Very well____ Well____ Somewhat ____ Not at all_____

12. Participation of enrollees

Very frequent____ Frequent___ Infrequent___ None_____

13. Attitude of enrollees

Very enthusiastic___ Enthusiastic___ Passive____

Somewhat enthusiastic__ Very unenthusiastic_

14. Attitude of teachers

Very enthusiastic____ Enthusiastic____ Passive____

Lackadaisical_____ Very lackadaisical________

15. Would you tell me something about your relations with Bd. of Ed. personnel.

16. How would you rate your relation with Bd. of Ed. personnel?

	Very Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
Teachers	____	____	____	____	____
Curriculum Specialists	____	____	____	____	____
Area Supervisor	____	____	____	____	____
Central Office	____	____	____	____	____

17. What did you see as the agency's role in the educational program?

18. What role did the Bd. of Ed. play in the educational program at the agency?

19. What changes would you want to take place in the educational program for the future?

20. What parts of the program would you want to remain as is?

21. Of what value would you say the summer program have been to the enrollees?

Very positive____ positive____ neutral____ negative____ very negative____
Explain

22. Assume you could organize the program by yourself with adequate funds, how would you organize it?

23. Of what help were the curriculum specialists in the planning and operation of the program?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Questionnaire for the Educational Directors

1. Name ______________________ 2. Agency _________________________

3. Age _______ 4. Sex M ___ F ___

5. Position during regular year:

    a) Regularly licensed teacher
    b) Principal
    c) Assist. Principal
    d) Substitute teacher
    e) Other (specify)

6. Years experience: ______ Specify role (as teacher, as principal, etc.)

7. Place of employment during regular year ___________________________

8. Post high school education

    Where? ______________________________________

    College degree(s) ___________________________

9. Graduate education ________

10. Number of teachers responsible to you ________

11. Number of enrollees _______

12. How did you learn about the position at the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

    Date you began to work ___________________

13. What help from any source did you receive in organizing the program?

14. How did you obtain your teachers?

    Any suggestions?

Quetstionnaire for the Educational Directors
(continued)

24. What formal training and experience would you want your teachers to have, if you had a choice?

25. Ideally, at what location would you prefer to have the education part of the program take place?

26. Would you return to work at the same job next summer?